



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

We are not surprised to find in § 123 the acc. ending of *-i* stems given as *-em* or *-im* (for *i-em*), the Abl. s. as *-ē* or *-ī* (for *i-ed*), and the Dat. Loc. Abl. pl. as *-ibus* (for *i-ibus*), since Mr. Roby had carefully prepared us for this in § 50.

The catalogue of similar sins might be extended. Yet this part of the grammar has been done with evident care, and the analysis of *-i* and consonant stems, § 132, is new and interesting. We think the statement, that in consonant stems the final stem consonant is always preceded by a vowel, should be qualified; cf. stems *cord-*, *mell-*, *farr-*, *fell-*, etc. Nor can we see why, § 145, *rōbur* is called an *-r* stem (cf. *rōbus* Cato, and *rōbustus*), while *ōnus* is called a stem in *-us*.

In § 209 the fact is mentioned that *quisque* is used of a woman in Plautus, but that the interrogative *quis* is also used for *quae* we are nowhere told.

In § 238 Latin verbs are said to have inflexions to denote differences of voice, person, number, mood and tense. Which one of these things, pray, is denoted by the *n* in *pungo*, *punctus*, which in § 78 is (improperly) called an inflexion inserted in the middle of the stem? We have no desire to criticize severely Mr. Roby's peculiar views of tense and mood formation. The subject is beset with difficulties, and it is easier to tear down old theories than to build up satisfactory new ones. We hope that the "jung grammatiker" in Germany will some day clear away the mist. Of the *s* in the second pers. s. and pl. Perf. Ind. it may be said that no man knoweth whence it cometh, and Mr. Roby is only half in earnest when in § 304 he tries to persuade us that the suffix *-is* was once added throughout the perfect, the *s* having later been lost in the first and third s. and in the first pl.

The alphabetical list of verbs on pages 134-153 is very useful though incomplete, and showing in the assumed stems much of the same inconsistency already remarked, e. g. If *torse-* is the stem of *torreo*, then with equal right *terse-* is the stem of *terreo* (cf. *tristis*) and *vers-* not *verr-*—of *verro*.

Of typographical errors we have noted the following:

§ 35, *cāsula* for *cāsula*. § 112, *Claudii* for *Claudie*. § 147 (2), *Cerēs* for *Cerēs*. § 175, *ēgēnus* for *ēgēnus*. § 228, *tāmen* for *tāmen*. § 295, *nūbere* for *nūbere*. § 295, *pīg-* for *pīg-* (cf. § 329). § 311, *vād-* for *vād-*. § 315, *flōrē-* for *flōrē-*. P. 151, *invādēre* for *invādēre*. § 377, *sācērulum* for *sācērulum*.

In Book IV the absence of historical method is the most conspicuous fault; e. g. there is no hint of the development of *quom* clauses, nor of the later use of *quamquam* with the Subjunctive and with Participles. We might proceed to point out many excellent features and some defects, sed longum est ea dicere.

MINTON WARREN.

---

The Odyssey of Homer done into English Prose. By S. H. BUTCHER and A. LANG. Second Edition, revised and corrected, with additional Notes. London, Macmillan and Co., 1879.

It was my fortune some years ago to deliver a course of lectures on the Odyssey before an audience few of whom could read the original. As may be imagined, the question of illustrative translation was not the least troublesome, and while I tried to derive some advantage from a comparison of the various renderings, I longed for some good prose version that would at all events present what Villemain calls a plaster-cast of the great epic, and for my

immediate purpose I would gladly have given up the quaint embroidery of Chapman, the splendid artificiality of Pope, the reflective calm of Bryant, and even the 'lush' sweetness of Worsley, and all the lessons that might be drawn from these partial versions, for such a translation as the one for which the English-speaking lovers of Homer have to thank Messrs. Butcher and Lang. In their modest preface these accomplished scholars say, and say truly, that of Homer there can be no final translation, but for many years there will be no prose version that can rival this, and a new edition following so soon on the first shows that their good work has not lacked recognition. A detailed criticism of the book itself would be too late as well as unprofitable here. My present object is to call attention to some additions which enrich the new issue.

The translators have prefixed to this edition an introduction giving their views of the composition and plot of the *Odyssey*. As is almost inevitable with any one who works lovingly at the reproduction of the *Odyssey*, they believe in the unity of the poem. "The composition is elaborate and artistic, the threads of the plot are skilfully separated and combined. The whole is surrounded with the atmosphere of the kingly age of Greece, and the result is the *Odyssey*, with that unity of plot and variety of character which must have been given by one masterly constructive genius. The date at which the poet of the *Odyssey* lived may be approximately determined by his consistent description of a peculiar and definite condition of society which had ceased to exist in the ninth century B. C., and of a stage of art in which Phoenician and Assyrian influences dominated."

Of the new notes there is one of some length on  $\tau$ , 349, in which K. F. Hermann's view of ἀλφρηστής is maintained, that the word means 'bread-eater'; 3, 162, ἀμφιέλισσαι = *recurvatae*, 'with a curved beak at either extremity raised high out of the water,' illustrated by a picture from the reliefs at Medinet Habou (see also Mr. Merriam's Phaeacians noticed elsewhere, 6, 264). On 3, 378, there is an inconclusive note on Τριτογένεια which could not have been other than inconclusive. On the word ἄωρος, occurring in the description of Scylla (12, 89), Mr. D. B. Monro is represented as pointing out "the philological objection to the combination *αω* where we should expect either *εω* as in μετέωρος or *ηω* as in ἀπήωρος (Od. 12, 435)." He would therefore take ἄωρος in the usual sense 'unripe,' 'unformed,' and see a contrast between the dwarfed feet and the great growth of neck, the contrast being made by ἡ τοι . . . δέ τοι—compare line 86:

τῆς ἡ τοι φωνῇ μὲν ὅση σκύλακος νεογιλῆς  
γίγνεται, αὐτῇ δ' αὐτὴ πέλωρ κακόν.

The editors conceive that this would give a very satisfactory sense to the passage, but very properly say that the philological objection is not decisive against the commonly accepted version 'dangling.'

There is a note of much interest on 19, 578, in which the editors discuss Goebel's plausible suggestion that the axes resembled in shape our double battle-axes, and that the archer shot through the opening at the top, which almost forms a ring. It is contended that πρώτης in juxtaposition with πάντων would naturally mean the first of the row, not the outermost tip of the handle,

21, 422 [= ἀκρης στείλειῃς], and in this sense the translators take it, 'beginning from the first axe handle,' and say that the genitive is an 'ablative genitive, not uncommon in Homer,' though they would find it hard to parallel such an ablative use as this. They further urge that we are not acquainted with any examples of ancient Greek axes like that drawn by Goebel. Schliemann's double-headed axes are hammer-headed. Then comes the difficulty of shooting through the handle hole, whether by a standing (19, 575) or a seated archer (21, 420). The problem is to find an ancient axe through a hole in the metal of which it was possible to shoot. Egyptian axes with open-work blades are then adduced and figured, and finally there is a drawing of an axe the head of which, re-curved against the handle, forms a ring, which might answer the conditions of the Odyssean trial. Such an axe is wielded by an Amazon in a conflict with Herakles, as represented on a metope of a temple at Selinus. The last new note pertains to Homeric burial.

B. L. G.

---

The Phaeacian Episode of the *Odyssey*, as comprised in the sixth, seventh, eighth, eleventh and thirteenth books: with Introduction, Notes and Appendix. By AUGUSTUS C. MERRIAM, Ph. D., Columbia College. Harper & Brothers, 1880.

Mr. Merriam's edition of the 'Phaeacians of Homer' does not belong to the ordinary run of school-books, and it would have been better, if he had frankly renounced any attempt to combine the requisites of a work for beginners with elaborate expositions which would be suitable only in a special discussion of the unity of the *Odyssey*. It is strangely incongruous to find a long glorification of Odysseus' address to Nausikaa followed by the elementary question: What parts of *εἰμί* are regularly enclitic? It is fair to say, however, that Mr. Merriam, as is shown by his preface, is firmly convinced that his method is right, and that he seems to hold himself distinctly responsible for much that would seem unpractical or undesirable; and as no one can follow him in his appeals to his personal experience as a teacher, it may be supposed that he has good warrant for the fulness of his archaeological notes, the prolixity of his aesthetic discussions and the apparent irrelevancy of many of his remarks. Still it is not to be doubted that Mr. Merriam's experience as an editor will check his tendency as a teacher to exuberance, and it is certainly to be hoped that a man who has shown ability both to work hard and to work independently, will not stop short of the great virtue of self-limitation. The introduction gives an outline of the Homeric Question—which is rather scant toward the close—and the appendix sets forth the discoveries of Schliemann and Cesnola, which have furnished the editor with many illustrations of the text. In the notes there are several elaborate discussions of syntactical points, as notably 8, 564, on the time of the aorist participle; but generally Mr. Merriam is content with a reference to Hadley or Goodwin or Curtius, even in instances in which these text-books are inadequate or misleading. He has also adopted the irritating, and in my judgment unfruitful, practice of interspersing grammatical questions for the purpose of stimulating the attention of the young student. In quotations from Gladstone, Mure and Hayman Mr. Merriam has been liberal, and there are many long passages from Homer printed in full with translations following; but